

## REMARKS

Claims 1-25, and 35 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-25 stand rejected. Claim 35 is new. Claims 26-34 are cancelled in the present reply.

### *Telephonic Examiner Interview*

Applicants thank examiner for the telephonic interview of February 6, 2009. The independent claims were discussed. No agreement between parties was reached.

### *Claim Objections*

Claim 1 stands objected to because the examiner states that the limitation, “a first environment stored in said at least one memory and a second environment stored in at least one memory” is not disclosed in the specification. While applicants respectfully submit that it is inherent that an environment would be stored in a memory, in the interest of expediting prosecution, applicants have amended the limitation to read “a first environment and a second environment.”

### *Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101*

Claims 32-34 stand rejected under 35 USC 101. Claims 32-34 are cancelled in the present reply.

### *Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112*

Claims 1-24 and 32-34 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Claim 1 stands rejected for the limitation, “a first environment stored in said at least one memory and a second environment stored in at least one memory.” As discussed, *supra*, applicants have amended the limitation to read, “a first environment and a second environment.”

Claim 1 recites the limitations “said at least one process” and “base layer.” Applicants have amended these limitations to read “at least one process” and “base component,” respectively.

Claim 13 recites the limitation “assurance policy.” Applicants have amended the preamble to recite “an assurance policy.”

The examiner states that “assurance policy” is indefinite. Applicants have amended claim 13 to read, “an assurance policy that corresponds to a level of assurance that the software will perform its expected functions correctly.” Support for this is found in at least paragraph [0051] of the specification.

The examiner rejects the use of “causes” and “cause” in claims 16 and 18, respectively. Applicants have amended the respective claims to read “directs a component responsible for visual output to display” and “direct a component responsible for visual output to display.”

The examiner rejects the limitation “permit” in claim 18. Applicants have amended the claim to read “allow.”

The examiner rejects the limitation “policy” in claim 20. Applicants have amended claim 13 to include the limitation “an assurance policy” and claim 20 depends from claim 13. The examiner rejects the limitation “assurance policy” in claim 23 as indefinite. Applicants respectfully submit that the present amendments to claim 13, from which claim 23 depends, overcome this rejection.

The examiner rejects claims 32-34 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Those claims are cancelled in the present reply.

For the above reasons, applicants respectfully submit that the above rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph have been overcome.

### ***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103***

Claims 1, 5-14, 19-20, 23-26 and 31 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muschellack et al. (Pat. No. 7,309,004) in view of J.E. Smith, “An Overview of Virtual Machine Architectures”, October 27, 2001.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 13 and 25. These amendments are supported by the specification in at least paragraphs [0006] and [0007].

Claim 1, as amended, recites limitations including, “said first software object sending said first of said plurality of data to said base environment, said first software object receiving processed data corresponding to said first of said plurality of data from said base environment, said first software object using said processed data to further process the plurality of data;” “said second software object receiving said first of said plurality of data

from said base component with a corresponding wrapper, said second software object verifying said first of said plurality of data as being unmodified by comparing said data to the corresponding wrapper, said second software processing said first of said plurality of data in a manner that resists tampering with said first of said plurality of data, said second software object sending said processed data to said base component;” and “said base component layer comprising or hosting logic that receives said first of said plurality of data from said first software object, applies the corresponding wrapper to said first of said plurality of data, said corresponding wrapper comprising said second software object and a seal that may be checked against said first of said plurality of data to determine whether said first of said plurality of data has been altered since the seal was determined...”

Applicants respectfully submit that Muschellack in view of Smith fails to teach every element of amended claim 1. As such, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 5-12 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 13, as amended, recites limitations similar to amended claim 1. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that Muschellack in view of Smith fails to teach every element of amended claim 13. As such, applicants respectfully submit that claim 13 is in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 19-20 and 23-24 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons that claim 13 is in condition for allowance. Claim 25, as amended, recites limitations similar to amended claim 1. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that Muschellack in view of Smith fails to teach every element of amended claim 25. As such, applicants respectfully submit that claim 25 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 26 and 31 are cancelled in the present reply.

Claims 2-4, 15-18 and 29-30 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muschellack in view of Smith and in further view of Clapper (Pub. No. 2003/0107584).

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-4 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully submit

**DOCKET NO.:** MVIR-0110/301118.01  
**Application No.:** 10/693,749  
**Office Action Dated:** October 27, 2008

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116**

that claims 15-18 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons that claim 13 is in condition for allowance. Claims 29-30 are cancelled in the present reply.

### **CONCLUSION**

In the view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow the application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' representative.

Date: February 27, 2009

/Peter Trahms-Neudorfer/  
Peter Trahms-Neudorfer  
Registration No. 59,282

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439